



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

and not followed up by our Government. Americans are being thrown in jail without trial. The representatives sent down here are either in with one set of Mexicans or the other, being paid to send what news they wish printed. Mr. Wilson has so often broken faith with these Mexicans, that now they no longer fear him.

The trains to Mexico City run perhaps once or twice a week. The journey is perilous owing to there being bandits scattered along the way who attack and rob the trains if they so choose. There are but few coaches, and so few engines that it is hard to operate. No freight is carried and so business is at a standstill. Carranza has stolen and shipped out of the country everything salable, even the supplies sent down by the Red Cross. A reporter, Mr. Francis, got photographs of the bags, etc., and informed Mr. Silliman, Mr. Wilson's special representative. Instead of notifying Washington, Mr. Silliman notified Carranza, and in a short time Mr. Francis was thrown into jail "incommunicado."

The Administration in Washington knows what terrible conditions exist down here. Our men are being killed on the border by the very ammunition and firearms brought from the United States to be turned against Americans, and by the soldiers of Carranza, whom Mr. Wilson is consulting and has recognized—he whom every Mexican, even his own men, hates. He can never be President, for the people won't stand for him. He has looted Mexico from the border down, and how can he make good? I beg of you to find out the truth and tell the people of our great country so that they may come to know what we are suffering, and help us.

AMERICAN.

VERA CRUZ, MEXICO.

### A GOOD WORD FOR SAUL OF TARSUS

SIR,—I have been a reader of the REVIEW for many years, and have always considered it reliable. One of the most satisfying features of it to me is the fact that dependance could be put in the knowledge and the ability of the writers of its contributed articles. Consequently I received a rude shock when I read the article on Saul of Tarsus by Ellwood Hendrick; for I happen to know a little about Saul myself. For flippancy of treatment and for ignorance of the facts involved, I have never seen, in any self-respecting periodical, the equal of this output. Hereafter, how am I to know that other writers in the REVIEW, treating of subjects concerning which I am not well informed, are not as incompetent as the author under consideration?

I have not time to speak of all this man's errors now. I wish, however, to refer to two or three by way of illustration. For instance, he tells us that Paul was the inventor of the doctrine of hell-fire. The fact of the matter is that Paul never mentions hell-fire at all in any of his epistles or reported sayings. He also alleges that Paul was the author of the dogma of the Virgin Birth; but the truth is that Paul never refers to the Virgin Birth. So far as the records go, there is no evidence that he knew anything about it. Moreover, he further alleges that Paul greatly emphasized baptism, and made it necessary to salvation. Now anyone who knows a little about Paul knows that the exact contrary is the truth, as is proved by many passages, and especially by I Corinthians, 1:13-14. Finally, to say, as he does, that Paul was without love, and that he taught that women

generally were a temptation and a danger, is to betray an ignorance of his subject so colossal as to merit nothing short of contempt.

F. D. McRAE.

ST. PAUL, MINN.

### MR. HENDRICK'S REPLY

SIR,—The mechanism of the mind is a curious thing, very complex, and the wonder is that we mortals can agree as well as we do. We seem to be constructed with a view to fighting each other, and if it were not for the gift of sympathy the world would be a sorrier place than it is even in these days.

I agree with Mr. McRae in regard to my ignorance and incompetence, and I suppose he is right in calling me flippant. I can not take orthodoxy seriously. I can not focus it in my mind as that arrangement of all the facts which is the truth. Call it bedevilment if you will, my vision of orthodoxy is always as of something grotesque.

Now the pages of *THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW* are not long enough to permit contributors of Letters to the Editor to quote the Scriptures to prove their contentions, because the sayings of Holy Writ are many and divers. But on re-reading my essay I think it possible to support nearly every statement by texts,—which would neither prove anything nor make it perfect.

Indeed, I should be the last to call it perfect. Its faults, however, appear to me to be more clearly pointed out by a clergyman who addressed me from another State than by Mr. McRae. He said that, on the whole, he agreed with me, but thought I missed one quality of Paul, and that my failure to mention it colored my whole essay to its hurt. This was that Paul was a mystic. I think he is right, and that I am at fault in this respect. But mysticism seems to be one of my blind spots, and here again Mr. McRae is right in regard to my incompetence. The same gentleman also says that I am not quite fair to Paul. This, too, may be just criticism. I have heard Paul quoted in defense of so much meanness in this world that I may be, in a measure, angry at the thought of him. And anger blinds. It is idle to put confidence in what anyone of us says in his wrath. Anger is the mother of error.

In a personal letter which Mr. McRae was good enough to send me he tells me that "One of the best established laws of psychology is that we select our beliefs. One can very easily make himself believe or disbelieve a thing if he wants to; the wish is father to the thought." This statement is singularly free from heresy except perhaps for a touch of Pelagianism. Many an institution of orthodoxy has been built upon it, including the Holy Inquisition. I once made an earnest plea for the doctrine that we have within us the capacity to select our own ideals, and despite any seeming contradiction I still hold to it. But as for this ability to believe or disbelieve in concrete things at will, I am afraid the rule is not universal. Some of us are so organized that we can not bring ourselves to believe what, according to the testimony of all of our faculties, offends against the truth.

My postulate is that the Christology of Jesus and the Christology of Paul are not the same, and that they are in sore conflict. There are those of us who are not so gifted with the faculty of volitional belief that they can hold Paul in reverence. Why then may we not look beyond Paul to the